



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

THE JEWS IN THE WORKS OF THE CHURCH FATHERS.

FOR the history and science of Judaism, and especially for a full understanding of the Agada, the study of the Church Fathers undeniably possesses considerable importance. Naturally all of them are not of the same value. Those who lived in Italy, Spain, or Gaul, and had little communication with Jews, are of minor significance for Jewish literature, compared with the Fathers of Palestine, Syria, and Egypt. I shall therefore pay the most attention to those Fathers whose writings promise the richest results, and we can herein confidently follow the lead of Jerome, who, in his reply to his opponent Rufinus's charge, that he associated too much with Jews, quoted the examples of Origen, Clement, and Eusebius, none of whom disdained to receive instruction from teachers of the Hebrew race (Lib. I., adv. Ruff., c. 13, vol. ii., p. 469, Ed. Vallarsi). If the first notable Father, Justin, and Ephraem Syrus, Jerome's younger contemporary, be added, we obtain the following list of Ecclesiastics, whose writings are of especial interest to us :—Justin Martyr, Clemens Alexandrinus, Origen, Eusebius, Ephraem Syrus, and Jerome.

In the last four decades, since the importance of Patristic literature has obtained a gradually increasing recognition in Jewish circles, students have always sought in the Fathers for Agadic elements which they might collate with Hebrew sources. The fact has, however, been lost sight of, that these Agadas have not always come direct from the Jews. Many of those found in the Church literature must be regarded as the product of independent development. The Agadic exegesis of the Scriptures was peculiar

to the spirit of the times, and flourished among the Christians as exuberantly as among the Jews. The accounts in the Church Fathers of Judaism and of Jewish conditions and modes of life are, in my opinion, no less worthy of regard than the Agadic elements there preserved. I shall, therefore, direct my main attention to this class of notices, and only speak of such Agadas as were expressly and explicitly borrowed from the Jews.

For the works of Justin, Clement, Origen and Eusebius, I have used Migne's *Patrologie* (M.); for Ephraem, the Roman edition (R.) of 1732-43; for Jerome, Vallarsi's edition (V.), Verona, 1734-42. Other editions will be quoted occasionally.

I.

JUSTIN MARTYR.

Justin Martyr was born about 100 A.D., in Flavia Neapolis, formerly called Sichem, in the country of the Samaritans. He terms himself a Samaritan, which does not, however, mean that he belonged to the religious sect of the Samaritans, but that they were his countrymen.¹ He, indeed, expressly states that he was one of the uncircumcised.² At a later period he came to Ephesus, the scene of his dialogue with the Jew, Tryphon (Eusebius *H. E.*, iv. 18); and here he zealously propagated Christianity among the Jews.³ The date of the Dialogue coincides with the period of the revolt under Bar Cochba (132—135). That obstinate contest is frequently mentioned in it;⁴ and Tryphon is described as a fugitive who escaped from the turmoil of Palestine to peaceful Ephesus.⁵

¹ *Dial.* c. 120 (vi. 755, M.), . . . ἀπὸ τοῦ γένους τοῦ ἐμοῦ, λέγω δὲ τῶν Σαμαρείων.

² *Ib.* c. 29 (vi. 537, M.), τίς οὖν ἐγὼ περιτομῆς λόγος . . .

³ This follows from several passages of the *Dialogue*; v. Wetzer-Welte's *Kirchenlexicon*, vi. 2067.

⁴ *E.g.* *Dial.* c. 108 (vi. 725, M.), cp. *Apol.* I. 31 (vi. 376, M.).

⁵ At the beginning of the *Dialogue*.

These data alone should have sufficed to prove the historical character of the Dialogue. Nevertheless, scholars have apparently favoured the theory that it is only a literary framework for presenting Justin's views, and is purely imaginary. Emphasis is laid upon the fact that Tryphon makes concessions to Justin such as no faithful Jew would possibly have made.¹ The obvious explanation is that politeness induced Tryphon to adopt a conciliatory and yielding tone. Throughout the Dialogue he appears as an enlightened Jew, imbued with Hellenistic culture, who is anxious to exhibit extreme courtesy towards his adversary. He is introduced as a man of education and a philosopher. When Justin remarks, in the course of the interview, that he has no oratorical ability, the Jew replies with tact: "You must be jesting; your conversation proves you a past master in rhetoric."² Tryphon's concessions are, moreover, in most cases, only hypothetical; and Justin very often imitates him in this respect, admitting even once for instance, for the sake of argument, that Jesus was nothing more than a *Magus*.³ Besides, details are given which are unsuitable to a fictitious dialogue, but have a meaning if we assume that the writer reports events which actually took place. On the first day, we are told, no strangers were present at the interview; on the second day, however, Tryphon is joined by some Jews of Ephesus, who take a part in the discussion.⁴ One of them begs that a remark which had pleased him might be repeated, and Justin complies with the request.⁵ Another of those who had accompanied Tryphon on the second day, called Mnaseas, also joins in

¹ Weizsaecker, *Jahrb. für Theologie* XII. (1867), p. 63.

² *Dial.* c. 58 (vi. 606, M.), οὐ κατασκευὴν λόγων ἐν μόνῃ τέχνῃ ἐπιδείκνυσθαι σπεύδω . . . Καὶ ὁ Τρύφων· εἰρωνεύεσθαι δέ μοι δοκεῖς, λέγων δύναμιν λόγων τεχνικῶν μὴ κεκτηῖσθαι.

³ *Apol.* I. c. 30 (vi. 273, M.).

⁴ *Dial.* c. 118. (vi. 749, M.), διὰ τοὺς σήμερον σὺν σοι ἀφιγμένους . . .

⁵ *Ib.* c. 74 (vi. 649, M.).

the debate.¹ This circumstance suggests the inference that not only Tryphon, who from the first inspired Justin with respect as a man of Hellenic culture, but that other members of the Jewish community of Ephesus were also sufficiently well educated to be able to stand their ground against the learned Church Father. Occasionally they give audible token of their satisfaction or disapproval,² even applauding and hissing, just as in a theatre.³ Justin repeatedly, in the course of the disputation, bears testimony to the respect he feels for his learned opponent, and promises, when the Dialogue appears in its written form, to truthfully present Tryphon's views.⁴ At the close of the debate, Jew and Christian confess that they have learnt much from one another, and part with expressions of mutual goodwill.⁵ These details can only be reminiscences of a real event.

That Tryphon was the famous sage Tarphon (טרפון) is more justly discredited. Justin's description of his antagonist does not tally with what we know of R. Tarphon. The Tanaite was certainly not a philosopher of Tryphon's type. Though Tarphon and Tryphon are not identical, Graetz thinks the name was purposely chosen by the Father, so that he might be able to boast that he had won over the eminent teacher, Tarphon, to Christianity.⁶ But it is questionable whether the Hebrew טרפון really cor-

¹ *Ib.* c. 85 (vi. 677, M.), οὗ καὶ πάλιν ἐπιμνησθήσομαι διὰ τούτου, τοὺς μὴ καὶ χθὲς σὺνοντας ἡμῖν . . . Καὶ Μνασίας δὲ τις ὀνόματι τῶν συνελθόντων αὐτοῖς τῇ δευτέρᾳ ἡμέρᾳ εἶπε . . .

² *Ib.* c. 38 (vi. 557, M.), μὴ ταράσσεισθε εἴ, ἀλλὰ μᾶλλον προθυμότεροι γενόμενοι ἀκροαταὶ καὶ ἐξετασταὶ μένετε καταφρονοῦντες τῆς παραδόσεως τῶν ὑμετέρων διδασκάλων.

³ *Ib.* c. 122 (vi. 760, M.), καὶ ὥσπερ ἐν θέατρῳ ἀνέκραγόν τινες τῶν τῇ δευτέρᾳ ἀφιγμένων.

⁴ *Ib.* c. 80 (vi. 664, M.), τῶν γεγενημένων ἡμῖν λόγων ἀπάντων . . . σύνταξιν ποιήσομαι ἐν οὗτῳ καὶ τοῦτο ὁμολογοῦντά με ὃ καὶ πρὸς ὑμᾶς ὁμολογῶ, ἐγγράψω.

⁵ *Ib.* *ad' fin.*

⁶ *Gnosticismus u. Judenth.*, p. 17.

responds to the Greek *Τρύφων*, in which case only could Justin have intended טרפון by his *Τρύφων*. Jerome, in his list of the oldest Tanaim, calls טרפון 'ר Telphon.¹ He would have probably written *Τρύφων* had the two names been equivalent.² Goldfahn's theory that Tryphon was selected by Justin, because it sounded like δρύπτω, needs no refutation.³

Accepting the historical character of the Dialogue, we naturally cannot seek for covert allusions in the name Tryphon. It was probably in common use among the Jews of that age, and there is nothing remarkable in the fact of Justin's having happened to meet a Jew with this name. The same is the case with Mnaseas, which was also frequent from an early period. We find it in Josephus (*Cont. Apion.* i. 23). ר' שמעון בן מנסיא, of a subsequent date, is frequently mentioned in Mishna, Tosefta, Talmud and Midrash; in T. Babli (Beza 30b) the name is spelt מנשיא. Zunz quotes a Mnasea, grandson of a Mnasea, from the Seder-ha-doroth, fol. 68b (Gesammelte Schriften II., p. 23). Tryphon and Mnasea were thus ordinary names among the Jews; and nothing is less surprising than that Justin's chief opponent in the Dialogue, and another Jew of Ephesus, should have borne them.

Justin's writings constitute the first attempt which has come down to us to justify Christianity before the bar of the ancient religious powers, Heathenism and Judaism. Early Christendom still clung somewhat nervously to the old faith. Christians still practised many Jewish customs,⁴ and Justin feels the need of offering an excuse for the

¹ In Is. viii. 11.

² A. Geiger, *Jüd. Zeitschrift* v. 173, proposes to read instead of Delphon (a variant of Telphon) simply *Tarphon*; this is surely inadmissible; טרפון is perhaps the same as Τερπών (Fick, *Griech. Personennamen*, p. 81), which corresponds more closely to the form Telphon.

³ Goldfahn, *Justin Martyr und die Agada* in Graetz's *Monatsschrift* XXII. (1873), p. 49, *et seq.*

⁴ Smith-Wace, *Dict. of Christian Biography*, III. 581.

Christian transference of the Sabbath-day to Sunday.¹ Judaism has no right, the Father thinks, to thrust out its daughter Christianity, for it has also produced other heresies which it does not disown. The Sadducees, Genistae, Meristae, Galilaei, Helleniani, Pharisei and Baptistae are all Jewish sects, so that it becomes a matter of some difficulty to decide which among them represents the real Judaism.² To this argument Justin attaches special importance, deeming it expedient at the same time to apologise to the Jews for the harshness of his words.³ The Jews, he urges, had sent emissaries in all directions to calumniate the new sect.⁴ This charge recurs in almost every Church Father; it is also frequently asserted that the Hebrews were zealously engaged in proselytizing. Thus in Justin's time, we may conclude with a high degree of probability, Judaism still retained its power of expansion. The prophetic promise that the Word of God would reach distant nations the Hebrews saw fulfilled in the accession of proselytes to their ranks, the Christians, in the spread of their own creed.⁵

¹ *Dial.* c. 24 (vi. 528, M.).

² The names of these sects are cited by Eusebius, *H. E.* iv. 22 (xx. 381, M.), from the work of an older author, Hegesippus. There they are called Ἑσσαῖοι, Γαλιλαῖοι, Ἡμεροβάπτισται, Μασθοβαῖοι, Σαμαρεῖται, Σαδδουκαῖοι, Φαρισαῖοι. In the *Indiculus Haerescon*, which is ascribed to Jerome, the *Hemerobaptistae*, *qui quotidie corpora sua et domum et suppellectilem lavant* figure as the tenth sect. We recognise this sect as the טובלי שחרית of *Berach*, III. 6c; they must not be confused with the Essenes. Justin's Baptistae are very likely the same as these Hemerobaptistae. Concerning the Genistae, Meristae, Galilaei and Helleniani the views of scholars are widely divergent, and we will leave the question open. It is remarkable, however, that the *Essaeans* are mentioned neither by Justin nor by Eusebius, and not even by Isidorus, *Orig. libr.* VIII.; the Christians probably felt that they themselves had taken their origin from this sect, and were, therefore, unwilling to designate them as heretics.

³ *Dial.* c. 80 (vi. 665, M.), καὶ μὴ ἀηδῶς ἀκούσῃ μέ μου πάντα ἃ φρονῶ λέγοντος.

⁴ *Ib.* c. 108 (vi. 725, M.).

⁵ *Ib.* c. 122 (vi. 760, M.), concerning Is. xlix. 6, ταῦτα ὑμεῖς μὲν εἰς τὸν Γῆθραν καὶ τοὺς προσελύτους εἰρῆσθαι νομίζετε.—Γῆθρα is either גִּתְרָא or גִּתְרָא.

Jewish religious teachers are frequently mentioned by Justin, usually under the title of Rabbi,¹ sometimes also simply as διδάσκαλοι;² in a few instances, as heads of the Synagogue, ἀρχισυνάγωγοι;³ an insulting epithet is invariably added. The Rabbinical teachings are termed traditions, παραδόσεις.⁴ Instruction was given at the conclusion of divine worship.⁵ Disputations between learned Christians and Jewish Rabbis were the order of the day. Numerous specimens are found in Hebrew literature. Justin ridicules the tactics of the Jewish controversialists, who always hunted up their opponents' weak points, like the fly which settles on sore places. If, at a disputation, a multitude of well-considered and well-weighed arguments are adduced, the Jews will always discover a neglected point open to attack.⁶ Such controversies might sometimes prove disadvantageous to Judaism, where expert Christian dialecticians overwhelmed ignorant Jews with arguments which they were not prepared to answer, and by which they would have to acknowledge themselves beaten. Justin strove personally for the conversion of the Jews; his efforts were, however, futile, owing to the accident that he met his match in his opponents at Ephesus. Ordinary Jews, not specially skilled in controversy, were strictly enjoined to avoid polemics with Christians.⁷ And even Tryphon, who presented so bold a front to his opponent, regretted his breach of this rule.⁸ By this we

¹ Dial c. 112 (vi. 736, M.), Θελόντων 'Ραββί, 'Ραββί καλεῖσθαι.

² Ib. c. 110 (vi. 729, M.), *et passim*.

³ Ib. c. 137 (vi. 792, M.).

⁴ Ib. c. 38 (vi. 557, M.), *et passim*.

⁵ Ib. c. 137 (vi. 792, M.), διδάσκουσιν . . . μετὰ τὴν προσευχήν.

⁶ Ib. c. 115 (vi. 744, M.), "Ὡσπερ γὰρ αἱ μυῖαι ἐπὶ τὰ ἔλκη προστρέχετε καὶ ἐφίπτασθε. κἂν γὰρ μυρία τις εἴπῃ καλῶς, ἔν δὲ σμικρὸν ὅτιοῦν εἴπῃ μὴ εὐάρεστον ὑμῖν, ἢ μὴ νοοῦμενον ἢ μὴ πρὸς τὸ ἀκριβές, τῶν μὲν πολλῶν καλῶν οὐ πεφροντίκατε, τοῦ δὲ μικροῦ ῥηματίου ἐπιλαμβάνεσθε, καὶ κατασκευάζετε αὐτὸ ὡς ἀσέβημα καὶ ἀδίκημα σπουδάζετε.

⁷ Ib. c. 112 (vi. 736, M.), ἢ καὶ ἡμῶν ἐξηγουμένων παραγγέλλουσιν ὑμῖν μὴδὲ ὅλως ἐπαίειν, μὴδὲ εἰς κοινωνίαν λόγων ἔλθεῖν.

⁸ Ib. c. 38 (vi. 556, M.), καὶ ὁ Τρύφων εἶπεν . . . καλὸν ἦν πισθέντας ἡμᾶς τοῖς διδασκάλοις νομοθετήσασιν μὴδενὶ ἐξ ὑμῶν ὁμιλεῖν . . .

may gather how the Rabbinic regulations were respected by the people at large. A Jew of Ephesus tells us that for the solution of his doubts and difficulties he often referred to the Rabbis, whom the people regarded as their appointed leaders.¹

The differences between the Synagogue and the Church turn mostly on the exegesis of Holy Writ; a large portion of the Agada in the Midrash and Talmud is a polemic against Christianity. The text of the Scriptures also constituted an important subject of controversy; the Christians usually read into the Bible more than it contained. Moreover, instead of admitting that their copies were often incorrect, they cherished the delusion that the Jews had falsified and mutilated the text for polemical purposes. This charge already occurs in Justin, who accuses the Jews of altering *παρθένος* in Is. vii. 14 into *νεάνις*, in order to nullify a Christological argument.² He quotes many passages which, he alleges, are only to be found in the old texts, but have been omitted from the new editions.³ But he is honest enough to reject a manifest Christological gloss interpolated in the Greek version, and gives the preference in this case to the Hebrew text.⁴

In Justin we also meet with a charge which, as far as we know, does not recur in any other Church Father. He accuses the Rabbis of encouraging immorality by sanctioning polygamy among their co-religionists, and

¹ *Ib.* c. 94 (vi. 701, M.).

² *Ib.* c. 68 (vi. 633, M.).

³ *Ib.* c. 72 (vi. 645), on Jerem. xi. 19, καὶ ἐπειδὴ ἡ περικοπὴ ἢ ἐκ τῶν λόγων τοῦ Ἱερεμίου ἐστὶ ἐγγεγραμμένη ἐν τισιν ἀντιγράφοις τῶν ἐν συναγωγαῖς Ἰουδαίων· πρὸ γὰρ ὀλίγου χρόνου ταῦτα ἐξέκοψαν. He cites similar passages to the same effect.

⁴ This gloss is the notorious ἀπὸ τοῦ ξύλου which was said to be the reading in Ps. xcvi. (xcv.). Besides occurring in Justin, *Dial.* c. 73 (vi. 645, M.), this interpolation is found only in Latin Fathers, such as Tertullian, Ambrosius, Augustinus, Leo and Gregorius Magnus, who manage to talk a great deal of nonsense concerning the "a ligno."

permitting them to lust after fair women.¹ He blames the facility with which marriages are contracted. When a Jew is abroad, the first thing he does is to take another wife.² This matrimonial liberty was indeed, as a matter of fact, a painful characteristic of Talmudic times.

Justin, too, is the first who imputes to the Jews the crime of mocking at and insulting Jesus. This accusation was fraught with terrible consequences for them. It is repeated by all the Fathers of the first four centuries, and though the accounts have been frequently examined, the precise character and truth of this charge have never yet been definitely established. I take the liberty, therefore, of discussing this branch of our subject in some detail.

Although the Fathers are clear as to the fact of a curse pronounced by the Jews, they differ widely as to the object of the curse. Some assert that Jesus was cursed; others that the malediction was directed against Christianity or the Christians. Starting from this point of difference, we classify the weightier statements bearing on this subject under three heads.

I. Malediction against Jesus. Justin, *Dialogue*, c. 103 (vi. 720, M.), (cp. vi. 553, M.), καὶ μάλιστα τοὺς ἐν ταῖς συναγωγαῖς, καταναθεματίσαντας καὶ καταναθεματίζοντας ἐπ' αὐτὸν τοῦτον τὸν Χριστὸν; Origen, *Hom. in Jerem.* xviii. 12 (xiii. 487, M.), Εἴσελθε εἰς τὰς τῶν Ἰουδαίων συναγωγάς, καὶ ἴδε τὸν Ἰησοῦν καθ' ἡμέραν ὑπ' αὐτῶν τῇ γλώσσει τῆς βλασφημίας μαστιγούμενον.

II. Against Christians and Christianity. Justin, *Dialogue*, c. 16 (vi. 512, M.), καταρώμενοι ἐν ταῖς συναγωγαῖς ὑμῶν τοὺς πιστεύοντας ἐπὶ τὸν Χριστόν. Similarly *ib.* c.

¹ *Dial.* c. 134 (vi. 785, M.), τοῖς ἀσυνέτοις καὶ τυφλοῖς διδασκάλοις ὑμῶν, οἵτινες καὶ μέχρι νῦν καὶ τέσσαρας καὶ πέντε ἔχουν ὑμᾶς ἕκαστον συγχωροῦσι καὶ ἰὰν εὐμορφὸν τις ἰδῶν ἐπιθυμήσῃ αὐτῆς.

² *Ib.* c. 141 (vi. 800, M.), καὶ ὅσας βούλεται λαμβάνειν γυναῖκας, ὁποῖον πράττουσιν οἱ ἀπὸ τοῦ γένους ὑμῶν ἄνθρωποι, κατὰ πᾶσαν γῆν, ἔνθα ἂν ἐπιδημήσωσιν ἢ προσπεμφθῶσιν, ἀγόμενοι ὀνόματι γάμου γυναῖκας.

93, (vi. 700, M.)¹; Origen, *Hom. in Jerem.* xviii. 12 (xiii. 485, M.), καὶ μέχρι νῦν, ὑπὸ παρανόμου ἀρχιερέως λόγου προστάσσομενοι Ἐβιωναῖοι² τύπτουσι τὸν Ἀπόστολον Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ λόγοις δυσφήμοις.

III. Against the Nazarenes. Epiphanius, *Haeres.*, xxix. 9, Πάνυ δὲ οὗτοι ἐχθροὶ τοῖς Ἰουδαίοις ὑπάρχουσιν. Οὐ μόνον γὰρ οἱ τῶν Ἰουδαίων παῖδες πρὸς τούτους κέκτηνται μῖσος, ἀλλ' ἀνιστάμενοι ἔσωθεν (i. ἔωθεν) καὶ μέσης ἡμέρας καὶ περὶ τὴν ἑσπέραν, τρεῖς τῆς ἡμέρας, ὅτε τὰς εὐχὰς ἐπιτελοῦσιν ἐν ταῖς αὐτῶν συναγωγαῖς, ἐπαρῶνται αὐτοῖς καὶ ἀναθεματίζουσι φάσκοντες, ὅτι ἐπικαταράσαι ὁ Θεὸς τοὺς Ναζωραίους. Jerome in Isaiah ii. 18, Sub nomine Nazaræorum anathematizant vocabulum Christianum. *Ib.* 49, 7, Christo sub nomine Nazaræorum maledicunt. *Ib.* 52, 4, sub nomine, ut saepe dixi, Nazaræorum ter die in Christianos congerunt maledicta, etc., etc.

This last group is in various ways most instructive. We learn from it that the curse was pronounced thrice daily; the eighteen Benedictions are obviously suggested. Epiphanius has further the important notice that it was recited ὅτε τὰς εὐχὰς ἐπιτελοῦσιν, which does not mean "at the conclusion of the prayers,"³ but "while they read the prayers." The commination was thus a portion of the daily service, and has long since been justly identified with the ברכת המינים, "the prayer against heretics." That this blessing differed in Talmudic times from its present form is quite clear. It must then have explicitly named the Nazarenes, for Epiphanius gives us the definite formula, "May God curse the Nazarenes." The Talmud, which fully discusses this "blessing," nowhere hints that the Nazarenes

¹ On this v. Goldfahn, *ibid.*, p. 56.

² The Ebionites, as is the case in many other respects, are here placed on a level with the Jews; what is predicated about them applies also to the Jews.

³ This is Schuerer's opinion: *Geschichte des jüd. Volkes im Zeitalter Jesu Christi*, II. 387. The passage of Justin adduced there is not exactly in place.

figured in it. Indeed, although several Christian sects are named in that extensive literature, the Nazarenes do not once occur in it.¹ This by no means proves that this name was unknown to the Talmudic doctors. Probably נוצרי very often occurred in the Talmud, but has been erased by the mediæval censors. There were sufficient grounds for this. Catholic Christendom hated other Christian heresies as much as Judaism did, and therefore tolerated allusions to them in the Talmud. But it would not permit mention of the Nazarenes, for these, at an earlier period, were synonymous with the Christians. The Christians were called Nazarenes,² a name which they have retained in Jewish literature to this day. Our quotation from Jerome now becomes clear: *The Jews curse the Christians or Christ under the name of Nazarenes, i.e., the malediction in the liturgy is nominally directed against the Nazarenes but really against the Christians.* From the turn of the phrase, it is evident that Jerome thought he had made a discovery. "How artful the Jews are," he seems to say, "they curse the Nazarenes when they mean the Christians." This then is established, that the so-called Benediction of the Minim contained, in ancient times, the term נוצרי; and, in fact, a gloss of Rashi, which escaped the censors, and is still preserved in later authorities, makes it clear that, in his days even, the Blessing still retained the term נוצרי.³

The problem still remains, Which expression is it that has replaced the original נוצרי? What word has been substituted for it by the censors or out of fear of them? J. Derenbourg assumes that the original form of the Benediction consisted of the following three parts: ולמלשינים על ההי הקוה וכל עושי רשעה כרגע יאבדו וכל

¹ That בינצרפי in b. Sabb. 116a is the same as בינצרני is only a conjecture of several scholars, which, however, cannot be defended.

² Cp. Tertullian in *Marc.* vi. 8, unde . . . nos Judaei Nazaraeos appellant. Jerome, *On Sacr.*, 143, 16 (ed. Lagarde II. p. 175): et nos . . . apud veteres Nazaraei dicebamur.

³ V. M. Bloch, *Institutionen des Judenthums*, I. 193.

ולמלשינים יכרהו, and that, instead of ולמלשינים, the word ולמינים or ולמשרתים was substituted in R Gamaliel's days, while, at a still later date, והזדים was added against the Romans.¹ I consider this supposition highly improbable. We can hardly believe that the term ולמלשינים would have been dropped, when we reflect how much cause there was in every age for the retention of a commination against the dangerous *Delatores*. Besides, the Christians cannot, in this prayer, be designated by the term מינים, which is manifestly the same as *μινᾶι* or Minaei; for the Christians regarded this sect as damnable heretics, and would not have had the slightest objection to their being cursed by the Jews. The truth seems to be that the covert reference lies in the phrase וכל עושי רשעה. It is with regard to these words that the Codices of the Liturgy exhibit such numerous variations, which proves that they were not part of the original form of the prayer. Maimonides does not read וכל עושי רשעה, but וכל אפיקורסים.² This passage, then, is the one directed against the heretics. The modern וכל עושי רשעה, which looks so innocent, must have been adopted as a cover for the far more suspicious and dangerous expression נוצרים. So, too, in another passage (*Jerusalem Berachot*, 5d, ed. Krotoschin) the expression רשע is used as the designation of a sect רני כולל של מינים ושל הרשעים במכניע זדים. *Tosefta Berachot* iv. 25 has, instead of רשעים, the more forcible פושעים. *Massechet Derech Eretz Rabba* (beginning of chap. ii.) has הצדוקים והמסורות והרשעים; *Exodus Rabba*, c. 19, מינים ומשומדין ורשעי ישראל. In all these passages the word רשעים can only refer to a sect. I believe that the second phrase read originally וכל הנוצרים כרגע וכל הנוצרים כרגע. As, however, נוצרי was primarily the title of Jesus, the earlier Fathers were correct in asserting that the Jews cursed Jesus, inasmuch as the expression may refer equally

¹ *Revue des Etudes Juives*, xiv. 30.

² Derenbourg, *ibid.*

to Jesus or to Christianity. As in their time Christians and Nazarenes were still identical, they had no need to explain the difference of designation. In Epiphanius' and Jerome's days the Nazarenes were only a sect, and no longer formed the whole of Catholic Christendom. These Fathers found it, therefore, necessary to say that the Jews in their formula of malediction cursed the Nazarenes, but meant the Christians.

Thus the accounts of the Church Fathers on this head are harmonised.

Returning to Justin, we note that Agadic elements are to be found in his writings in considerable quantity ; most of them have been thoroughly discussed by Goldfahn in his essay, "Justin Martyr and the Agada." (Graetz's *Monatschrift* xxii., 1873, and in a separate reprint.)

II.

CLEMENT OF ALEXANDRIA.

The writings of Titus Flavius Clemens of Alexandria offer but few materials of interest for Jewish literature. His distinguishing excellence consisted in a sound knowledge of Hellenic literature rather than of theology. His information about Judaism he seems to have derived exclusively from Greek writings, particularly from Philo and Josephus. A persecution of the Christians, which raged in Alexandria in the years 202 and 203, drove Clement to seek safety in flight, and he appears to have taken up his residence for a short while in Syria (Euseb. *H. E.*, VI. 11). Here he may have gleaned something from the Jews at first hand. Of Hebrew he was not altogether ignorant. Most of his explanations of terms are indeed unfortunate, and argue little for an intimate knowledge of the language. But that he possessed a certain acquaintance with Hebrew is proved by the prolix remarks found in his writings on the

characteristics which distinguish Hebrew from other languages.¹ It should also be borne in mind that his quotations sometimes differ from the Septuagint, and this variation would seem to show that he consulted the original text.² Only on the supposition that Clement had a command of Hebrew can we account for the fact that he criticises adversely those who, when reading Scripture, pervert its plain meaning by their tones, and place a forced construction on clear and wise laws by their transposition of points and accents.³ That this reproach is aimed at the Jews is obvious. And it is a valuable testimony, from a comparatively early period, to the free and unrestricted manner in which the text of Holy Writ was handled for Agadic purposes.

Hostile expressions against the Jews are not found in his writings. His essay *Κανὼν ἐκκλησιαστικὸς ἡ πρὸς τοὺς Ἰουδαϊζόντας* (Euseb. *H. E.*, VI., 13) may have contained some; but the work, with the exception of a few fragments, is lost. He argues that the Jews have no right to twit Christianity with its numerous sects, seeing that Judaism is also rent by factions, but that nevertheless its professors strive their hardest to win converts.⁴ He betrays his contempt by the anxiety which he expresses in his exposition not to be confounded with the vulgar Jews.⁵ Apart

¹ *Strom.* vi. 15 (viii. 353, M.), "Ἐχει δ' οὖν καὶ ἄλλας τινὰς ιδιότητας ἡ Ἑβραίων διάλεκτος, καθάπερ καὶ ἐκάστη τῶν λοιπῶν . . .

² A striking deviation in the translation of Leviticus xi. 13, 14 (*Deut* xiv. 12) is noticeable, 'Ἄλλ' οὐδ' ἱκτῖνα ἡ ὠκύπτερον μαστοφαγῇ ἡ αἰτὸν φαγεῖν φησὶν . . . *Paed.* iii. 11 (viii. 653, M.). The words ὠκύπτερον μαστοφαγῇ are wanting in the LXX.

³ *Strom.* iii. 4, end (viii. 1144), Οὗτοι εἰσιν οἱ κατὰ τὴν ἀνάγνωσιν φωνῆς τόνῳ διαστρέφοντες τὰς Γραφὰς πρὸς τὰς ἰδίας ἡδονάς, καὶ τινων προσφιδῶν καὶ στιγμῶν μεταδίδουσι τὰ παραγγελθέντα σωφρόνως τε καὶ συμφερόντως βιαζόμενοι πρὸς ἡδυπαθείας τὰς ἑαυτῶν.

⁴ *Ib.* viii. 15 (ix. 524, M.), πρὸς τὰ ὑπὸ Ἑλλήνων καὶ Ἰουδαίων ἐπιφερόμενα ἡμῖν ἐγκλήματα ἀπολογησάσθαι . . . Πρὸς οὗς φαμέν· "Οτι καὶ παρ' ὑμῖν τοῖς Ἰουδαίοις . . . πάμπολλοι γεγόνασιν αἱρέσεις· καὶ οὐ δήπου φατὲ δεῖν ὀκνεῖν . . . ἰουδαΐζειν.

⁵ *Ib.* vii. 8 (ix. 553, M.), Ἰουδαίων τῶν χυδαίων.

from these isolated instances, he is a defender of Judaism rather than an antagonist. In his *Stromata* an endeavour is made to prove that the Greek philosophers obtained their wisdom from Jewish teachers, and that the Jewish law stands higher than Hellenic law.

Agadic elements are more plentiful in Clement's writings than the course of his studies would naturally lead us to expect. He lays great value on the traditions of the true and hidden sense of Scripture¹ preserved by Jewish teachers, whom he knows as the *μύσται*, a term probably current in Alexandria.² As he, however, usually quotes traditions without naming the *μύσται* in connection with them, it is a matter of some difficulty to distinguish in his writings those elements which are of specifically Jewish origin. But as a proof that his works do contain genuine Jewish traditions I quote the following specimens. He tells us (*Strom.* I. 23, viii. 900 M.) on the authority of the *μύσται*, that Moses slew the Egyptian with a "mere" word, *φασὶ δὲ οἱ μύσται λόγῳ μόνῳ ἀνελεῖν τὸν Αἰγύπτιον*. This is identical with the well-known tradition which explains the text (Exod. ii. 14) *הִלַּחֲרַנִי הִלַּחֲרַנִי אֶת־הָאֱלֹהִים* as meaning that Moses pronounced the Ineffable Name, and thereby destroyed the Egyptian taskmaster. (See *Exodus Rabba*, and Rashi *ad locum*.)

Clement notes (*ibid.* viii., 897 M.), that the law-giver had several Hebrew names besides his Egyptian one—Moses; his parents called him at his circumcision *יהוויקים*;³ and after his death he received, according to the Mystae, a new name, *Μελαχί* (*מלכי*?). This is undoubtedly a genuine Jewish Agada; though I cannot, at present, trace its parallel in

¹ *Strom.* i. 12 (viii. 753, M.), *τὰς ἀποκρύφους τῆς ἀληθοῦς γνωσίως παραδόσεις . . .*

² *Vide infra.*

³ This observation is also noteworthy from a sociological point of view; we are thereby informed that already in the second century it was customary among the Jews to give their sons names on the occasion of their circumcision (but see Luke i., 59).

Jewish sources. There is a discussion in T. B. *Sota*, 12a, and *Exod. R.* 1, between some Tanaites on the name Moses¹; but there is no hint of Jehojakim, or of the name conferred upon the leader after his death. It should also be noticed that the phrase *μετὰ τὴν ἀνάληψιν* implies another Agada; that Moses, like Enoch and Elijah, did not die, but was translated to heaven. This legend is clearly alluded to in Jude, verses 8, 9. It is also found in detail in *Deut. R.*, ad finem Babylonian Talmud *Sota* 13b, *לֹא מָת מֹשֶׁה*. Cp. also *Baba Bathra*, 17a, where it is said that Moses belonged to those against whom the angel of death was powerless, *לֹא שָׁלַט בָּהֶם מַלְאֲךְ הַמּוֹת*. Maimonides quotes the legend at the beginning of his Introduction to the Talmud.

After these undoubted specimens of Jewish Agadas we feel ourselves justified in ascribing a Jewish origin to some of Clement's obscurer legends. Clement notes, in connection with Genesis xv. 5, that Abraham, according to the opinions of some, perceived the divine wonders of the Creation and the beautiful order of nature. This exegesis is opposed to the Christian interpretation, which sees in the text a reference to Jesus, the Son of God (*Strom.* v. 1, ix. 20 M.): "*ῥσπερον δὲ, ἀναβλέψας. εἰς τὸν οὐρανόν, εἶτε τὸν υἱὸν ἐν τῷ πνεύματι ἰδὼν, ὡς ἐξηγουῦνται τινες, εἶτε ἄγγελον εὐδοξόν, εἶτε καὶ ἄλλως ἐπιγνοὺς Θεὸν κρείττονα τῆς ποιήσεως, καὶ πάσης τῆς αὐτῇ τάξεως.*"

The Midrash, commenting on the same verse (*Gen. R.*, c. 44), says that the contemplation of the star-spangled firmament made the patriarch feel himself an astrologer, which agrees with his having realised the order of nature.² Even the added touch that Abraham saw an angel is not merely invented by Clement; for the Midrash remarks (on verse 7) that Michael was the saviour of Abraham and would

ר' מאיר אומר טוב שמו רבי יהודה אומר טוביה שמו ר' נחמיה אומר ר' הגון לנביאות.

נביא את ואין את אכטרולוגוס.

become ultimately the saviour of his posterity. Clement had doubtless heard this Agada, but reproduced it in the wrong place. Clement states that Buzzi, Urias the son of Samaia, and Habakkuk were Jeremiah's contemporaries. *προφητεύουσι δὲ καὶ Βουζὶ καὶ Οὐρίας ὁ υἱὸς Σαμαίου καὶ Ἀμβρακὸν σὺν αὐτοῖς. Strom. i., 21 (viii., 849). Cp. Strom. i. 21 (viii., 872 M.), where Σοφωνίας Βουζὶ follow after Jeremiah. This notice is evidently based on an Agada. And, in fact, *Seder Olam R.*, c. xx. *ad finem*, collates the following passages:—דבר ה' אל צפניה כו' דברי ירמיהו בן חלקיהו אשר היה דבר ה' אליו וכו' וגם איש היה מתנבא בשם ה' וכו' היה היה דבר ה' אל יחזקאל בן בוזי וכו' כולם נתנבאו סמוך לחורבן.*

According to this quotation, Zephaniah, Jeremiah, Uriah (Jerem. xvi. 20), and Ezekiel were contemporary prophets; this is in complete agreement with Clement. We are thus also in a position to identify Clement's enigmatic Buzi—who has given this Father's editors so much trouble—with Ezekiel, *son of Buzi*. Either "Ezekiel" has dropped out, or his father is really meant, in accordance with the tradition that where a prophet's father is named, he too was a prophet.

Graetz, in his *Hagadische Elementen bei den Kirchenvätern* (Fränkel's *Monatsschrift*, III., 1854, p. 311), first drew attention to the agreement between Clement and the *Seder Olam Rabbi*. I will give one more striking instance. Clement says, *Strom. i.*, 21 (viii., 842 M.), that Elisha commenced to prophesy at the age of forty, and prophesied for a period of six years. Whence is this statement, which is given with as much emphasis as if it rested on Scriptural authority, derived? The *Seder Olam R.*, c. xix., says:—מכאן אתה מחשב כמה שנים פרנס—אלישע את ישראל.....ייותר מששים שנה. Undoubtedly we ought to read in the Greek, not εἴξ, but ἐξήκοντα (instead of ξ', equal to 60, ζ', equal to 6, was written by mistake). This tradition, then, Clement has in common with the *Seder Olam*. That Elisha commenced his prophetic career at the

age of forty we do not find in any of the Jewish sources ; it must nevertheless have been a common tradition, and the same supposition would account for many other of Clement's statements. In conclusion, we may note that this Father was acquainted with many more traditions than he gives. He, for example, alludes to an exposition of the Mystae in connection with the sacrificial ritual, but does not say anything more definite about it.

III.

ORIGEN.

Origen was born, probably, in Alexandria, about 185 or 186 A.D. It is generally assumed that his parents were Christians, but this was probably the case on one side only. His father's name, Leonides, has been preserved, but not that of his mother. This omission is not accidental, but is due to the reverence of pious Christian writers for Origen's memory, which led them to suppress his mother's name on account of her Jewish descent.¹ The fact that she knew enough of Hebrew to teach her son,² and that he occupied himself with the study of that language, contrary—according to Jerome—to the usage of his nation and age, are strong evidence in favour of this view.³ His impulse to Hebrew studies he probably received from his Jewish mother.⁴ In his capacity as Bishop of Cæsarea, in Palestine, Origen must have come into frequent contact with learned Jews, as indeed appears from his writings. He mentions again and again his *Magister Hebraeus*, on whose authority he gives several Agadas.⁵ His depen-

¹ *Strom.* ii. 20 (viii. 872, M.), *ἐν αἰρίας ἄς ἰσαῖον οἱ μύσται.*

² Jerome, *Ep.* xxxix. *ad Paulam*, c. 1, Tum vero quod in Origine quoque illo Graecia tota miratur, in paucis non dicam mensibus, sed diebus, ita Hebraeae linguae vicerat difficultates, ut in *discendis canendisque Psalmis cum matre contenderet.*

³ Cp. Smith-Wace, *op. cit.*, iv. 976.

⁴ Jerome, *De viris illustr.* 54, contra aetatis gentisque suae naturam.

⁵ *De Princ.*, 1, 3, 4, iv. 26 ; in the Greek Fragment, ὁ Ἑβραῖος. I may

dence on Jewish masters is already emphatically noted by Jerome.¹ He often mentions the views of the Jews, by which phrase he refers not to the teaching of certain individuals, but to the method of exegesis universally prevalent among the Hebrews of his time.² Those of them with whom he cultivated personal intercourse were distinguished by their scientific attainments. The one Jew whom he names is no less considerable a personage than Hillel, the Patriarch's son, or Jullos, as Origen calls him.³ His other Jewish acquaintances were either closely related to the patriarch's family or occupied a high position on account of their erudition.⁴ No wonder that with such opponents Origen carefully avoids, in his polemic, offensive expressions; forming, in this respect, a noble exception to the usual practice of the Church fathers. Origen fights principles, not their representatives or exponents. Occasionally, however, a harsh sentence against his Jewish antagonists escapes him.⁵ He even ventures to assert that the Jews of his time could no longer boast of men of real knowledge.⁶ Consistently with this adverse judgment, Origen labours chiefly to refute the scriptural exposition of Jewish teachers, and to establish in lieu thereof his own exegesis. He not only had private interviews with Jewish

remark here that I give my quotations in Greek when the original writings of Origen remain, and in Latin when only the Latin translation has survived.

¹ Jerome, *Lib. i. adv. Ruf.*, c. 13; cp. the Introduction supra.

² E.g., *Ep. ad Africanus* § 12, *φασὶ δὲ οἱ Ἑβραῖοι*. For other quotations see infra.

³ My especial authority for this is Graetz's "*Hillel, the son of the Patriarchs*" (*Monatsschrift* xxx., 1881, p. 433, etc.). My revered teacher, Professor W. Bacher, in his *Hagada of the Palestinian Amoraim*, i. 92 and 107 § 2, suggests the hypothesis that Origen also had intercourse with Hoshja.

⁴ Grätz, *op. cit.*

⁵ *Hom. x. in Jerem.* § 8 (xiii. 368, M.), *βλέπετε αὐτῶν τὰς καρδίας διεσθιομένους ὑπὸ τῶν δυνάμεων ἀντικειμένων*.

⁶ *Ib.* § 3 (xvii. 361, Gr. Text is not clear), *Neque magistri neque doctores in Judaea aliqui remanserunt: et licet sint innumerabiles qui sibi sapientiam vindicent, non est jam sermo Dei in eis*.

teachers, but also engaged in public disputations in the presence of large audiences, which included among their ranks competent controversialists. This we gather from several expressions in his writings.¹ The principal topics discussed at these meetings may be summarised as follows:—

1. *The Scriptural Text.*—The copies of the Bible that circulated among the Christians were, as we have already had occasion to remark, corrupt in several passages. At a disputation between Jews and Christians, the former, naturally enough, alluded to these mistakes, and mocked their opponents for allowing such obvious blunders. This kind of argument, the first beginnings of which we have traced in Justin, plays an important part in Origen. The wish to free the Church from the just reproaches of the Jews on this score, led him to undertake that gigantic enterprise, the fruit of which is the Hexapla.²

2. *The Apocrypha.*—Another point of difference was the

¹ *Contra Celsum* I. 45 (xi. 744, M.), Μέμνημαι δὲ ποτε ἐν τινι πρὸς Ἰουδαίων λεγομένους σοφοὺς διαλέξει χρησάμενος τοιοῦτω λόγῳ, πλείονων κρινόντων τὸ λεγόμενον. *Ib.* I. 55 (xi. 761, M.), Μέμνηται δὲ ποτε, ἐν τινι πρὸς τοὺς λεγομένους παρὰ Ἰουδαίοις σοφοὺς ἐνζητήσῃ ταῖς προφηταῖς ταύταις (*Jesaja* liii.) χρησάμενος· ἐφ' οἷς ἔλεγεν ὁ Ἰουδαῖος *Ib.* i. 56 (xi. 764, M.), καὶ μέμνημαί γε πάντῃ θλίψας τὸν Ἰουδαῖον νομιζόμενον σοφὸν ἐκ τῆς λέξεως ταύτης· ὃς πρὸς αὐτὴν ἀπορῶν, εἶπε τὰ τῷ ἑαυτοῦ Ἰουδαῖσμι ἀκόλουθα, etc., etc.

² Epiphanius, *De ponderibus et mensuris*, c. 2, Ὁριγένης . . . ἀποκατίστησε τῷ ἑκάστῳ τόπῳ τὸν ἐλλείποντα λόγον . . . ἵνα μὴ παραλείψῃ Ἰουδαῖος καὶ Σαμαρίταις ἐπιλαμβάνεσθαι τῶν ἐν ταῖς ἀγίαις Ἐκκλησίαις θείων Γραφῶν—Ruffinus lib. v. *Invect. adv. Hieronymum*, c. 4, Apostatae quidem et Judaei interpretati sunt ea, quorum lectione Judaei maxime utuntur. Et quia frequenter si disputatio incidisset, vel immutata esse aliquanta, vel deesse, vel abundare in nostris Scripturis mentiebantur, voluit *Origenes* nostris ostendere, qualis apud Judaeos Scripturarum lectio teneretur . . . ut sciremus non quid nobis, sed quid Judaeis adversum nos certantibus aut deesse, aut abundare videntur. Origen recurs frequently to the Jewish method of reading, e.g., *Hom. in Num.* xvi. 4, Hebraei habere se scriptum dicunt.—*Comm. in Ep. ad Rom.* lib. ii. § 13 (xiv. 909, M.), ipsi in Hebraeis exemplaribus habere se dicunt

Apocrypha, to which the Church attached an exaggerated importance, notwithstanding its frequent want of taste and silliness, over which the Jews could only make merry. The history of Susanna was always derided by them for this reason.¹ The Jews had an Apocrypha of their own, which they valued; but this seems to have been distinguished from what we term Agada only in as far as it was already written down, while most other Agadas were still orally circulated.² Origen draws no distinction between the Jewish Apocrypha and Jewish traditions, knowing that they merged into one.³ It is especially noteworthy that he also knew of the existence of certain mystic writings, by which he could not have meant either Apocrypha or Agada, for both these classes of literature were known to him under their proper names.⁴ He must have been thinking of such works as treat of the מעשה מרכבה, or מעשה בראשית, etc., writings which, according to

¹ *Epistola ad Africanum de historia Susannae* § 5, 'Ἀσκοῦμεν δὲ μὴ ἀγνοεῖν καὶ τὰς [sc. γραφὰς] παρ' ἐκείνοις, ἵνα, πρὸς Ἰουδαίους διαλεγόμενοι, μὴ προφέρωμεν αὐτοῖς τὰ μὴ κείμενα ἐν τοῖς ἀντιγράφοις αὐτῶν, καὶ ἵνα συγχρησώμεθα τοῖς φερομένοις παρ' ἐκείνοις· εἰ καὶ ἐν τοῖς ἡμετέροις οὐ κείται βιβλίους· τοιαύτης γὰρ οὔσης ἡμῶν τῆς πρὸς αὐτοὺς ἐν ταῖς ζητήσεσι παρασκευῆς, οὐ καταφρονήσουσιν, οὐδ' ὥς ἔθος αὐτοῖς, γελάσονται τοὺς ἀπὸ τῶν ἰθὺν πιστεύοντας ὡς ἀληθῆ, καὶ παρ' αὐτοῖς ἀναγεγραμμένα ἀγνοοῦντας.—*Ib.* § 4, "Ὡρα τοίνυν εἰ μὴ λανθάνει ὑμᾶς τὰ τοιαῦτα, ἀθετεῖν τὰ ἐν ταῖς Ἐκκλησίαις φερόμενα ἀντίγραφα, καὶ νομοθεθῆσαι τῇ ἀδελφότητι, ἀποθέσθαι μὲν τὰς παρ' αὐτοῖς ἐπιφερομένας ἱερὰς βίβλους, κολλᾶκεῦειν δὲ Ἰουδαίους, καὶ πείθειν, ἵνα μεταδῶσιν ἡμῖν τῶν καθαρῶν, καὶ μηδὲν πλάσμα ἔχοντων.—From these concessions may be observed how weak the Church felt itself at that time. Later on the victorious Church used quite a different language.

² *Ib.* § 9, Σαφές δ' ὅτι αἱ παραδόσεις λέγουσι περὶ εἶναι τὸν προφήτην. καὶ ἐν τινι ἀποκρύφῳ τοῦτο φέρεται. A Hagada, therefore, which existed in an *apocryphon*, i.e. which was established in writing. Probably it is a reference to Ἀναβατικὸν Ἡσαίου, which is mentioned several times.

³ In Matt. xvii. 2 (xii. 1477, M.), εἴτε ἐκ παραδοσέων, εἴτε καὶ ἐπιβάλλοντες, εἴτε καὶ ἐξ ἀποκρύφων . . .

⁴ In Matt. Comm. ser. § 28 (xiii. 1636, M.), Ex libris secretioribus, qui apud Judaeos feruntur . . .

the Talmud, were wont to be withheld from the uninitiated and especially from Christians and heretics.

3. *Christian Dogmas.*—The mysterious birth of Christ still formed a point of controversy between Jews and Christians. Justin, who knew that the Jews could not and would not accept Christ's divinity, also touches on this theme.¹ Origen reports a far harsher judgment as the belief of the Jews. He says in his commentary on John xx. 14 (xiv., 608 M.), that the Jews spoke after the following fashion: 'Ἡμεῖς μᾶλλον ἕνα πατέρα ἔχομεν τὸν Θεὸν ἢ περ σὺ, ὁ φάσκων μὲν ἐκ παρθένου γεγενῆσθαι, ἐκ πορνείας γὰρ γεγεννημένους. Jesus' illegitimate birth was always a firmly held dogma in Judaism, which found clear expression in its ancient and modern literature, passed over to the heathens of antiquity and lives to-day in the consciousness of every simple-minded Jew, who only knows as much on this subject as he has learnt from his parents. Must not this conviction have found expression in the Talmud? Has that monumental work, which contains such valuable evidence on the events of the first Christian centuries, nothing to tell us concerning this Jewish dogma? Certainly it has. The Talmud here agrees with Origen. The founder of the dominant creed it calls ישו בר פנדרא, or ישו פנדרא.² What does פנדרא mean? Although much has been written about this term, its significance and etymology have not been fixed. I here suggest an explanation, quite different from those hitherto proposed. In Sifri Deut., § 320, תהפוכות (Deut. xxxii. 20) is thus interpreted, הם הפכפכנים הם פורנים הם, "They are a common and degraded people." פורנים is the Hebrew transcription, with the plural suffix, of the Greek πόρνοι, as Levy (*Neuhebr. Wörterb.*, iv. 18a) correctly states. The Greek term πόρνος has become naturalised in the Rabbinic

¹ *Dial.* c. 49 (vi. 581, M.), ὁ Τρύφων . . . καὶ γὰρ πάντες ἡμεῖς τὸν Χριστὸν ἀνθρωπῶν ἐξ ἀνθρώπων προσδοκῶμεν γενήσεσθαι.

² Also פנכרא, which is even written פנחרא.

dialect, in which *πορνείον* and *πόρνη* also occur. Now, this passage in the Sifri has, as a *varia lectio*, פִּרְדָּנִים. Levy gives *πόρδων* as its equivalent, but this has nothing in common with *πόρνοι*. We believe that a purely phonetic phenomenon accounts for this variant. Between the liquids "r" and "n," the dental "d" has been inserted, a procedure familiar to philologists. פִּרְדָּנִים is thus the same as *πόρνοι*. The feminine form *πόρνη* shows a similar phonetic transformation in the word פִּרְדָּנִית.¹ We now arrive at the conclusion of this chain of reasoning. פִּרְדָּנִית and פִּנְדָּרָא (disregarding the feminine suffix) only differ in the relative position of the liquids "n" and "r." That these frequently change their places in the Rabbinic dialect in the case of words borrowed from the Greek is well known. It may therefore be confidently assumed that פִּנְדָּרָא is nothing but *πόρνη*, modified by phonetic influences. ישו בר פִּנְדָּרָא would thus mean Jesus, the son of the prostitute, or in Origen's phrase *ὁ ἐκ πορνείας γεγεννημένος*, or as the Pesikta Rabbathi has it בְּרָא דְזִנְיָהּ. This explanation sums up the beliefs held in Jewish circles concerning Jesus.² This does not shut out the view that the present form of the word פִּנְדָּרָא, which sounds like *παρθένος*, may also have been influenced by the Christian dogma that Jesus was the son of a virgin. The opposition between *ἐκ παρθένου* and *ἐκ πορνείας* forms even in Origen a sort of play upon words, and Jewish popular wit was probably not slow to take advantage of the similarity of sound.

4. *Abrogation of the Mosaic Law.*—The Pauline doctrine that Jesus' advent superseded the Law of Moses encountered a lively opposition down to the third century. The contradiction between Christ's declaration that not an iota of the Law shall be given up, and his followers' disregard of the

¹ This disagrees with the view of Levy, iv. 102a.

² I think it unnecessary to cite the Rabbinical passages relating to Jesus, as they are accessible in the Essay of Laible, *Jesus Christus im Talmud* (Berlin, 1891).

most essential Jewish observances was too glaring not to be noticed and severely reprehended by impartial heathens, who told the Christians that their spiritual conception of the Scriptures did not justify their neglect of the ceremonial laws; for there were Jews who also conceived their law spiritually and yet scrupulously practised all of them.¹ Origen nevertheless pours out the vials of his contempt on Jews "after the flesh."² He finds it unnecessary to wash the hands before meals; the sole requisite is spiritual purity.³ The fulfilment of the laws in a spiritual sense sometimes assumes a very comical aspect!

Origen brings against the Jews a charge already met with in Justin; viz., that the Jews falsify and mutilate the Scriptures.⁴ He is convinced that there is a want of agreement between the old and new copies of the Jewish Bible, and that much which exhibited a Christian tendency in the former, has been disfigured in the latter.⁵ He is unconscious that he is here guilty of a self-contradiction; for he often admits that the Jews possess the genuine, the Christians the corrupt text of Holy Writ.⁶ Especially instructive is Origen's testimony to the great attraction which Judaism possessed for the heathens. There must have been still many proselytes to Judaism in his day;

¹ *Contra Celsum* I. § 1 (xi. 793, [M.]), μηδὲ τοῦτο κατανοήσας, ὅτι οἱ ἀπὸ Ἰουδαίων εἰς τὸν Ἰησοῦν πιστεύοντες οὐ καταλειοίπασιν τὸν πατριὸν νόμον. Origen adds to this (§ 3), The Jew of Celsus ought rather to have said, τινὲς δὲ (ὑμῶν) καὶ διηγούμενοι ὡς ἐπαγγέλλεσθε, πνευματικῶς, οὐδὲν ἥττον τὰ πατρία τηρεῖτε.

² *Comm. in Matt.* xi. 12 (xiii. 939, M.), οἱ σωματικοὶ Ἰουδαῖοι.

³ *Ib.* xi. 8 (xiii. 928, M.), Ὡιοντο γὰρ κοινὰς μὲν καὶ ἀκαθάρτους εἶνα, χεῖρας τὰς τῶν μὴ νιψαμένων πρὸ τοῦ ἀρτοφαγεῖν . . . Ἡμεῖς δὲ οὐ κατὰ τὴν τῶν παρ' ἐκείνοις πρεσβυτέρων παραδόσιν . . . καθαίρειν πειρώμεθα . . .

⁴ *Hom. in Jerem.* xvi. 10 (viii. 451, M.), Judaei qui exemplaria nonnulla falsarunt.—The Greek text is here damaged.

⁵ *In Matt. Comm. ser.* § 28 (xiii. 1636, M.) in *Scripturis veteribus* quae legebantur in Synagogis eorum.

⁶ *Hom. in Jerem.* xvi. 10 (xiii. 450, M.), Εἴτα ἄλλη ἐστὶ προφητεία, ἣν οὐκ οἶδ' ὅπως παρὰ τοῖς Ἑβδομήκοντα οὐχ' εὔρομεν δὲ ἐν ταῖς ἐκδόσεσι, δηλονότι κειμένην ἐν τῇ Ἑβραϊκῇ . . .

otherwise there is no adequate reason for the vehement indignation with which he attacks the Judaizers, forgetting himself so far as to utter curses and imprecations, altogether unworthy of him, against those who were converted to the old faith.¹ Among the Christians, too, there were several "Judaizers." Many, especially women, kept the Sabbath on the same day of the week as the Jews; washed and adorned themselves in honour of the day.² Origen maintains that the Sabbath in the "carnal" sense, as the Jews conceive it, cannot possibly be observed; to carry out its ordinances literally, one would have to abide in the same place for twenty-four hours, without stirring. This point was often treated in controversies. It forms, even in Jerome's writings, the subject of a lively dispute between Jews and Christians.³ Besides the Sabbath, the Passover

¹ *In Matt. Comm. ser.* § 16 (xiii. 1621, M.), Arbitror ergo omnem hominem qui ex conversatione gentili Judaeorum factus est proselytus, filium gehennae fuisse et priusquam proselytus efficiatur.

² *Hom. in Jerem.* xii. 13 (xvii. 396, M.), Καὶ περὶ σαββάτου γυναῖκες μὴ ἀκούσωσι τοῦ προφητοῦ, οὐκ ἀκούουσι κεκρυμμένως, ἀλλὰ ἀκούουσι φανερώς. Οὐ λούονται τὴν ἡμέραν τοῦ σαββάτου . . .

³ *Comm. in Ep. ad Rom.* vi. 2 (xiv. 1094, M.), Quid enim tam impossibile, quam Sabbati observatio secundum litteram Legis, ut in multis saepe jam diximus? Jubetur enim non exire de domo sua, non se movere de loco suo, nihil oneris levare. Quae quia impossibilia vident Judaei, qui secundum carnem legem observant, inepta quaedam et ridicula commentantur, quibus impossibilitatem Legis sarcire videantur. Origen omits to tell us what these stupidities are. We discover them, however, through Jerome, *Ep. ad Algasiam*, c. 10 (iv. 207, ed. Martianay), Praeterea quia jussum est, ut diebus Sabbathorum sedeat unusquisque in domo sua, et non egrediatur, neque ambulet de loco, in quo habitat, si quando eos juxta litteras experimur arctare, ut non jaceant, non ambulent, non stent, sed tantum sedeant, sic velint praecepta servare, solent respondere et dicere: Barachidas et Simon et Helles magistri nostri tradiderunt nobis, ut bis mille pedes ambulemus in Sabbatho, et cetera istiusmodi. The answer of the Jew would probably in the original Hebrew run as follows: קבלה היא בירנו מפי ר' עקיבה משום ר' שמעון שאמר הלל, etc. In the Talmud and Midrash we frequently note apologetic utterance against the reproach of the Christians in reference to the keeping of the Sabbath, of which a few have been collected by N. Brüll, *Grätz Jubelschrift*, p. 191, N. 1. The laws concerning circumcision were declared by

was also kept according to Jewish rites by numerous Christians who prepared unleavened bread.¹ Origen asserts, that this sympathy with Judaism was not spontaneous, but was the artificial work of missionaries, who carried on a zealous propaganda on behalf of the ancient faith, and cajoled Christians to practise its rites.²

Origen has a large number of Hebrew traditions or Agadas; in this respect he stands, among the Church Fathers, second only to Jerome. It should be noted that Origen knows Jewish traditions which have reference to the Gospels. He gives, in the name of the Jews, an explanation of the term *κορβάν*, קרבן, which occurs in the New Testament.³ Iscariot, Judas the traitor's surname, also seems to have had a traditional, though erroneous, Jewish interpretation.⁴ His account of the Tetragrammaton and of the word pronounced in its stead, points to a genuine Jewish tradition.⁵ The Midrashim or Agadas, in the strict sense of the terms, which Origen quotes so profusely, he probably owed to his intercourse with distinguished Jewish friends.

Origen as impossible as those concerning the keeping of the Sabbath. See on that point Diestel, *History of the Old Testament*, p. 27, and Bacher, *Ag. of the Pal. Amor.*, I. 92, N. 4.

¹ *Hom. in Jerem.* xii. 13 (xiii. 396, M.), "Οσοι ἐν ὑμῖν (ἐγγὺς γάρ ἐστι τὸ πάσχα) ἄζυμα ἄγετε. I quote the text with some emendations.

² *In Matt. Comm. ser.* § 16 (xiii. 1621, M.), [Judæi] diligenter circum-eunt plurima loca mundi, ut advenas Judaizare suadeant.

³ *Comm. in Matt.* xi. 9 (xiii. 929, M.), οἱ δὲ φαρισαῖοι καὶ οἱ γραμματεῖς τοιαύτην ἐναντιομένην τῷ νόμῳ παράδοσιν ἐκδεύκασιν, ἀσαφέστερον ἐν τῷ Εὐαγγελίῳ κειμένην, ἣ οὐδ' αὐτοὶ ἐπιβεβλήκαμεν ἂν, εἰ μὴ τῶν Ἑβραίων τις ἐπιδίδωκεν ἡμῖν τὰ κατὰ τὸν τόπον οὕτως ἔχοντα . . . Κορβάν ἐστι ὁ ὀφείλεις μοι, τωτέστι, δῶρον. The same words, but not in the name of the Jew, are also found in *Theophylactus in Matt.* xv. 5.

⁴ *In Matt. Comm. ser.* § 78 (xiii. 1727, M.), Audivi quendam exponen-tem patriam proditoris Judæ secundum interpretationem Hebraicam *exsuffocatum* vocari.

⁵ *Selecta in Psalm* ii. (xii. 1104, M.), κύριον γὰρ ἐνθάδε ἀντὶ τοῦ Ἰαή εἶρηκεν, καὶ ἔστιν ἡ ἀρχὴ τοῦ ψαλμοῦ παρ' Ἑβραίοις "Ἀλληλουῖα". ἔστι δὲ τι τετραγράμματον ἀνεκφώνητον παρ' αὐτοῖς, ὕπερ καὶ ἐπὶ τοῦ πετάλου τοῦ χρυσοῦ τοῦ ἀρχιερέως ἀναγέγραπται, καὶ λέγεται μὲν τῷ Ἀδωναὶ προσηγορίᾳ, οὐχὶ τούτου γεγραμμένου ἐν τῷ τετραγράμματι.

His introductions to some of these Agadas show that he had a certain respect for them.¹ Most of them are also to be found in Jewish sources. Some have already been compared by Graetz in his *Hagadische Elemente bei den Kirchenvätern*. We will confine our attention to a few selected specimens, which will serve to show how useful it would be to collect and investigate the Agadas scattered through Origen's writings.

1.—“THE GARDEN OF EDEN, THE CENTRE OF THE WORLD.”

Selecta in Gen. ii. 8 (xii. 100, M.), *Οὐκοῦν παραδεδώκασιν Ἑβραῖοι, ὅτι ὁ τόπος ἐν ᾧ ἐφύτευσεν τὸν παράδεισον ἢ τὸν κήπον Κύριος ὁ Θεός, Ἐδὲμ καλεῖται· καὶ φάσιν αὐτὸν μέσον εἶναι τοῦ κόσμου, ὡς κόρην ὀφθαλμοῦ· διὸ καὶ τὸν ποταμὸν τὸν Φείσων, ἐρμηνεύεσθαι στόμα κόρης, ὡς ἐκ τοῦ Ἐδὲμ ἐκπορευομένου τοῦ ποταμοῦ τοῦ πρώτου.*

A remarkable Midrash of which I have failed to find an exact counterpart in Jewish writings. It may be a conclusion drawn from the old assumption that Palestine is the centre of the earth, while Eden was supposed to be in or near to Palestine. The precise situation of Paradise forms the subject of a Talmudic controversy. T. B. *Erubin*, 19a:—*גן עדן א'ר ר'ש לקיש אם בארץ ישראל הוא בית שאן פירחה ואם בערביא בית גרם פירחה*. On the other hand, Midrash Ps. xxi. 3, tells us: *שערי גן עדן כמוכין להר המוריה*. The interpretation of *פישון* as *פי אישון* is unknown to me in Jewish sources.

2.—POTIPHAR AND JOSEPH.

Origen says in a *catena regia*, quoted from a MS. in Montfaucon's Hexapla on Genesis xxxvii. 36: “Phutirpharem eundem ipsum esse tradunt, qui Josephi herus et socer

¹ *Hom. in Isajam* I. § 5 (xiii. 225, M.), *Cur non dicamus in praesenti traditionem quandam Judaeorum verisimilem quidem, nec tamen veram . . . It is a reference to the well-known tradition of the murder of the prophet Isaiah.*

fuit. Narrantque Aseneth illam matrem suam apud patrem accusasse, quod insidias in Josephum struxisset, non autem ab eo insidiis appetita fuisset. Quam ille Josepho sponsam dedit”..... The same tradition is given more explicitly in Jerome, *Quest. Heb.*, in Gen. xxxvii. 36: “Putiphar eunucho. Ubi quæritur, quomodo postea uxorem habere dicatur. Tradunt Hebræi emptum ab hoc Joseph ob nimiam pulchritudinem in turpe ministerium, et a Domino virilibus ejus arefactis, postea electum esse juxta morem Hierophantarum in pontificatum Neilopoleos, et hujus filiam esse Aseneth, quam postea Joseph uxorem acceperit.”¹

Three features are to be distinguished in these notices, (a) Potiphar, Gen. xxxvii. 36, is identified with Potipherah, Gen. xli. 45, and Asenath is, accordingly, Joseph’s former master’s daughter; (b) Asenath, according to this account, felt and evinced sympathy with her father’s slave before his imprisonment; (c) Potiphar, inflamed by the sight of Joseph’s beauty, contemplated the commission of an unnatural crime, but was stricken with impotence. The whole of this tradition, with the exception of the second part, which does not really belong to it, occurs in Jewish sources. We read in T. B. *Sota*, 136:—*ויקנהו פוטיפר אמר רב שקנאו*—*לעצמו [בא גבריאלי וכרכו] בא גבריאלי ופירעו מעיקרא כתיב פוטיפר ולבסוף פוטיפרע*. The words placed within brackets are erased by Rashi, because they are tautologous. R. Nathan, of the *Aruch*, retains them, and explains, *סירכו* לבצים ופרעו לגיר. This view is obviously preferable to Rashi’s. The words *כרים פרעה* form the basis of the interpretation *סירכו ופירעו*. We thus have here the express tradition that Potiphar is identical with Potipherah, and was stricken with impotence as a punishment for his evil intentions towards Joseph.

The same legend is recorded in other portions of Rabbinic literature. *Gen. R.*, c. 86, *פוטיפר שהיה פורע עצמו לע"ז*,

¹ This tradition is not found in Rahmer’s *Hebrew Traditions in the Works of Hieronymus*, Breslau, 1861.

כיון שירד חפר לשם נעשה פוטמן כרים פרעה שנכחד מלמד שלא לקחו אלא להשמיש וסירסו הקב"ה בגופו. Levy, *Neuhebr. Wörterbuch*, and Fürst, *Glossarium Græco-hebræum*, p. 163 b., give $\phi\omega\tau\epsilon\iota\nu\acute{o}\varsigma$ as the Greek original of פוטמן. Kohut's *Aruch Completum*, VI, 315b, agrees with Perles' *Rabbinische Sprach-u. Sagen-Kunde*, p. 21, that פוטמן is derived from $\pi\omicron\upsilon\tau\acute{\alpha}\nu\alpha$ = putana. Both explanations are incorrect; for $\phi\omega\tau\epsilon\iota\nu\acute{o}\varsigma$ would imply a eulogy of Potiphar, where none was intended by the Midrash, and "putana" is not Latin but Romaic. I venture to suggest that פוטמן = $\sigma\pi\acute{\alpha}\delta\omega\nu$, a eunuch; $\sigma\pi\acute{\alpha}\delta\omega\nu$ is the rendering of כרים, which the Septuagint and Vulgate give generally as well as Gen. xxxvii. 36, in the particular passage under discussion (see H. Rönsch, *Itala u. Vulgata*, second edition, p. 246). The name פוטיפרע, which sounded so strange to the Hebrew ear demanded an Agadic interpretation. It was accordingly bisected; the first half, פוטי, was explained in three ways: (a) as derived from פטם, *Gen. R.*, c. 86, שהיה פטם עגלים לע"ז; (b) from $\phi\acute{\omega}\varsigma$ "light," *Tanchuma* II., וישב, § 16, למה נקרא שמו פוטיפר, ¹ cp. *Jelamdenu*, quoted in *Aruch*, s. v., פט II., אומר ביוניתי, פוטיאל שהאיר במעשים טובים שאת אומר ביוניתי, פוטיאל; (c) from $\sigma\pi\acute{\alpha}\delta\omega\nu$, a "eunuch," *Gen. R.*, ib., where the words כרים פרעה are added to confirm the derivation. פרץ, the second component of the name, was interpreted in two ways: (a) as derived from פרע, to untie or loosen, *Gen. R.*, ib., שהיה פורע עצמו לע"ז; (b) from פרע, to cut out, T. B. *Sota*, 13b, בא גבריאלי ופירעו. Musafia, in *Kohut* I. 211, was guided by a right instinct when he adds מכרס וי'מ שהוא מכרס. He also thought of $\sigma\pi\acute{\alpha}\delta\omega\nu$. Our interpretation is confirmed by a passage in *Shir R.* I. 1, זה לפני חשוכים, פוטיפר שהחשיך הקב"ה עיניו וסירסו. This completely excludes the idea of Potiphar's enlightenment, or, according to Fürst, *ibid.*, his conversion. In the *Tanchuma*, Potiphar

¹ The passage שנכנס לביתו של פרעה ונעשה פוטינוס should be emended into כיון שנכנס יוסף לביתו נעשה [פוטיפרע] פוטמן according to *Gen. Rab.* and *Talkut*.

is not represented as the enlightened but as the enlightener, *i. e.*, the steward over Pharaoh's house, an office which has no obvious connection with *spiritual* enlightenment.

3.—DIVISION OF THE RED SEA INTO TWELVE PARTS.

Hom. in Exod. v. 5 (xii. 330, M.), *Audivi a majoribus traditum, quod in ista digressionē maris, singulis quibusque tribubus filiorum Israel, singulæ aquarum divisiones factæ sunt, et propria unicuique tribui in mari aperta est via, idque ostendi ex eo, quod in Psalmis (cxxxv. 13) scriptum est: Quid divisit mare rubrum in divisiones. Per quod multæ divisiones docentur factæ, non una. Sed et per hoc quod dicitur: Ita Benjamin junior in stupore..... (Psalm. lxxviii. 28) nihilominus unicuique tribui propius enumerari videtur ingressus. Hæc a majoribus observata in Scripturis divinis, religiosum credidi non tacere. Cp. Eusebius Comm. in Ps. lxxvii. 13 (xxiii. 113, M.), *φασὶ γοῦν Ἑβραίων παῖδες εἰς ἑβ' τμήματα διηρῆσθαι αὐτὴν κατ' ἀριθμὸν τῶν ἑβ' φυλῶν τοῦ λαοῦ.**

Every detail of this Midrash is found with wonderful similarity in the Jewish sources.

The division of the Red Sea into twelve parts, corresponding to the number of the tribes, is recounted in the *Mechilta* (Exod. xiv. 16) *נחלק לשנים עשר גזרים*. In Midrash on Psalm cxxxvi. 15, in *Yalkut Habakkuk*, § 565, and in *Yalkut Exodus*, § 245, *נחלק לשנים* is a mistake for *ל' עשר*. Even the verse with which this tradition is connected is the same in Origen and the Midrash. In the *Mechilta* (Exod. xiv. 15), the passage commencing *נחלק לשנים עשר גזרים*, breaks off abruptly. The expected conclusion is the deduction that the sea was divided into twelve parts. Maimonides knew this Midrash in its full form. Commentary on *Aboth* V. 4: *שנבקעו לדרכים רבים כמספר השבטים והוא אמרו לגזר וכו'.* In *Aboth de R. Nathan*, c. XXXIII. (v. I.), the circumstance is added that the tribes expressly stipulated that the sea should be divided into sections, *אמר להם משה קומו עברו*

אמרו לא נעבור עד שנעשה לפנינו גזרים גזרים שנאמר לגזר וכי Ps. lxxviii. 28, from which, Origen says, the same tradition is derived, is connected with it in the *Mechilta*, *ibid.* 6, *Sota*, 36b, Midrash on Ps. lxxviii. 14, where we read that the tribes disputed as to which of them was to be the first to pass through the Red Sea; the result could only have been that they crossed simultaneously by different routes.

4.—REPENTANCE OF KORAH'S SONS.

Comm. in Ep. ad Rom. x. 7 (xiv. 1262, M.), Non puto absurdum videri si ea quæ nobis de his etiam in veteri Testamento a patribus rationabiliter tradita sunt, his scilicet, qui ex Hebræis ad Christi fidem venerunt, in medium proferamus. Aiebant ergo tres illos filios Core, quorum nomina invenimus in Exodo (vi. 24)..... Aser..... Elchana..... et Abiasaph....., cum pater eorum Core pecasset una cum Dathan et Abiram..... istos segregasse a cœtu nefario et ab impia conspiratione sequestratos unanimiter ad Deum precem pœnitentiæ profudisse: atque exauditos a Deo non solum veniam pœnæ, sed et prophetiæ gratiam meruisse, et hoc quoque eis a deo poscentibus esse præstitum, ne quid triste aut exitiabile prophetare juberentur: et ob hoc omnes psalmos quicunque nominibus eorum attitulati referuntur, nihil triste adversum peccatores aut asperum continere.

Only that part of this beautiful Agada which refers to the repentance of Korah's sons is to be found in Jewish sources. A passage in Midrash to Ps. xlv. 4, runs as follows:—כך בן־קרח לא היו יכולין לומר שירה לפני הקב"ה בפייהם עד שרחש להם וקבלם מיד ולמה לא היו יכולין לומר שירה בפייהם לפי שהיתה שאל פתוחה מתחתיהם ואש בלחמת סביבותיהם: The שירה here mentioned is parallel to Origen's *preces pœnitentiæ*. This elucidates the passage in T. B. *Sanhedrin*, 110a (*Megilla*, 14a):—מקום נרבער להם בגיהנם וישבו עליו ואמרו: שירה. That this Agada is ancient appears from the unfamiliar word נרבער; cp. also Midrash on Psalms i. 5, and xlv. 1. In the Jewish sources we miss the fine touches of the gift of prophecy bestowed on Korah's sons, and of

the always comforting nature of the Korachide Psalms. Perhaps others will be fortunate enough to discover these points too.

5.—ISRAEL'S STRENGTH CONSISTS IN PRAYER.

Hom. in Num., xiii. 5 (xii. 672, M.), Ut autem scias tale aliquid cogitasser egem (Balak), ex scripturae verbis intellege, quæ ego a magistro quodam, qui ex Hebræis crediderat, exposita didici. Scriptum est ergo (Num. xxii. 4): *Et dixit Moab ad seniores Madjan: Nunc, ablinget synagoga hæc omnes, qui in circuitu nostro sunt, sicut ablingit vitulus herbam campi.* Aiebat ergo magister ille, qui ex Hebræis crediderat: Cur, inquit, tali usus est exemplo, dicens: sicut ablingit vitulus herbam campi? Ob hoc sine dubio, quia vitulus ore obrum-pit herbam de campo et lingua tanquam falce quæcunque invenerit, secatur. Ita ergo et populus hic, quasi vitulus ore et labiis pugnat, et arma habet in verbis ac precibus. Haec igitur sciens rex mittit ad Balaam, ut et ipse deferat verbis verba contraria et precibus preces.

This is a well-known Midrash. *Sifri* Num. xxii. 4, § 157; *Num. R.* c. 20, 3; *Tanchuma* II.; בלק, § 4; Rashi, *ad locum*: מה שור כחר בפיו אף הם כחם בפיהם.

6.—PHINEAS AND ELIJAH IDENTICAL.

Comm. in Joann. vi. 7 (xiv. 225, M.), Οἱ Ἑβραῖοι παραδιδόασιν Φινεὲς τὸν Ἑλεάζαρου υἱὸν . . . αὐτὸν εἶναι Ἑλῖαν καὶ ἀθάνατον ἐν τοῖς Ἀριθμοῖς αὐτῷ διὰ τῆς ὀνομαζομένης εἰρήνης ἐπηγγέλθαι.

Jerome knows the same tradition, which he thinks the Jews took from an apocryphal work. Eliam esse Phineas Hebræi ex Apocryphis persuasum habent (V. 813 Vallarsi). The sentence, הוּא אֵלִיָּהוּ פִּנְחָס is only found in *Yalkut Num.* 772, in the name of R. Simeon b. Lakish and ascribed to a Midrash as its original source. Its preservation in a miscellaneous collection is noteworthy. The ordinary Midrashim seem to have purposely suppressed it, because it smacked of Apocrypha. Its omission is particularly noticeable in

Tanchuma II., פנחס, § 3: לכן אמור לו הנני נותן לו את בריתי שלום וכן הוא אומר בריתי היתה אהו והחיים והשלום, which, as it stands, makes no sense. The *Yalkut*, ib., on the basis of Malachi ii. 5, infers that the peace promised Phineas was eternal life: ונתן לו חיי העולם הזה וחיי העולם הבא ונתן לו שכר טוב והיתה לו ולזרעו אחריו ברית כהונת עולם. Here, too, Origen, gives the correct tradition that Phineas' immortality is implied in the word שלום.

7.—ALLEGORICAL INTERPRETATION OF THE SERAPHIM.

De Princ. I. 3, 4 (xi. 143, M.), "Ἐλεγε δὲ ὁ Ἑβραῖος τὰ ἐν τῷ Ἑσαΐα δύο σεραφὶμ ἑξαπτέρυγα κεκραγόντα ἕτερον πρὸς ἕτερον . . . τὸν Μονογενῆ εἶναι τοῦ θεοῦ καὶ τὸ Πνεῦμα τὸ ἅγιον. Cp. *De Princ.* iv. 26 (xi. 400, M.), Nam et Hebræus doctor ista tradebat: pro eo quod initium omnium vel finis non possit ab ullo comprehendī, nisi tantummodo a Domino Jesu Christo, et a Spirito sancto, aiebat per figuram visionis Isaiam dixisse, duos seraphim solos esse, qui duabus quidem alis operiunt faciem Dei, duabus vero pedes, et duabus volant clamantes ad invicem sibi dicentes: Sanctus, sanctus, sanctus, etc. The same tradition was also known to Jerome, in Ep. xli. (lxv.) *Ad Pammachium et Oceanum*, who, however, rightly stigmatizes it as an odious and godless exposition. Had it not been expressly so stated, one could hardly believe that a Jew said it. The Christian terms, at least, are to be placed to a Church Father's account. I could not find this interpretation in the Jewish sources, and none will regret its absence.

8.—DANIEL, CHANANIAH, MISHAEL AND AZARIAH WERE EUNUCHS.

Comm. in Matt. xv. 5 (xiii. 1225, M.), Φασὶ δὲ Ἑβραίων παῖδες τὸν Δανιήλ καὶ τοὺς τρεῖς σὺν αὐτῷ Ἀνανιαν, Ἀζαρίαν Μισαήλ, ἐν Βαβυλῶνι εὐνουχίσθαι, πληρουμένης τῆς πρὸς τὸν Ἐzekίαν εἰρημένης προφητείας ὑπὸ Ἑσαίου ἐν τῷ "Ἀπὸ τοῦ σπέρματός σου λήψονται, καὶ ποιήσουσι σπαδόντας ἐν τῷ οἴκῳ τοῦ βασιλείως Βαβυλῶνος" (Is. xxxix. 7). Φασὶ δὲ ὅτι

περὶ τούτων καὶ Ἡσαΐας ἐπροφήτευσεν φάσκων “ Μὴ λεγέτω ὁ ἀλλογενὴς ὁ προσκείμενος κυρίῳ. ἀφοριεῖ με ἄρα κύριος ἀπὸ τοῦ λαοῦ αὐτοῦ,” καὶ τὰ ἐξῆς, ἕως τοῦ “ κρείττονα υἱῶν καὶ θυγατέρων ” (Is. lvi. 35).

Origen gives the tradition with more fulness of detail in *Hom.* in Ezek. iv., § 8 (xiii. 703, M.). On Ezek. xiv. 15: *Audivi quondam a quodam Hebræo hunc locum exponente atque dicente, ideo hos nominatos, quia unusquisque eorum (Daniel, Job, Noe) tria tempora viderit, lætum, triste et rursum lætum..... Noe..... vidit mundum ante diluviumin diluvio....., rursum in resurrectione omnium peccatorum. Dicit mihi aliquis: concedo de Noe, ut tria tempora viderit: quid respondebis mihi de Daniele? Et hic ante captivitatem in patria floruit nobilitate, et deinceps in Babylonem translatus eunuchus effectus est, ut manifeste ex libro illius intelligi potest; vidit et reversionem in Jerusalem. Ut autem probetur quod ante captivitatem eunuchus factus sit, assumamus id quod ad Ezechiam dictum est (Is. xxix. 7)..... Job..... fuit locuples..... deinde accepit diabolus potestatem adversus eum;..... post hæc apparet ei Dominus. Ib. § 5 (xiii. 700, M.). Daniel qui traditus est eunuchorum principi cum Anania, Azaria, Misaela, eunuchus fuit..... Quomodo filii Danielis docebuntur, quem eunuchum fuisse Judæi tradunt? Verum quia fertilis et sancta fuit anima illius, et propheticiis divinisque sermonibus multos liberos procreavit..... Catena Regia in Prophetas ad Ezek. xiv. 5: *Τιὸς ἔχει ὁ Δανιὴλ κατὰ τὴν αὐτὴν πνευματικὴν γένναν, οὗς ἐγέννησεν ἡ προφητεία αὐτοῦ. υἱοὺς γὰρ σαρκικοὺς οὐκ ἔσχεν. Εὐνοῦχος γὰρ ἦν, ὥς φασι.**

The same tradition we find in Jerome lib. I., adv. Jovin., c. 25: Superfluum est de Daniele dicere, cum Hebræi usque hodie autument et illum et tres pueros fuisse eunuchos, ex illa dei sententia (II. Reg. xx. 18).....

Jerome on Daniel i. 3: Unde et arbitrantur Hebræi Danielem et Azariam et Ananiam et Misaelem fuisse eunuchos.....Epiphanius, *de Vitis Prophetarum* (xliv. 424, M. *ser gr.*): *Καὶ ἦν ἀνὴρ σῶφρων, ὥστε θαυμάζειν τοὺς Ιου-*

δαίους πιστεύοντας εἰς αὐτὸν εἶναι σπαδόντα. Later Church Fathers also give the same tradition, which they have however drawn from Origen and Jerome.

This Agada is widely disseminated in Jewish literature. All the details correspond; the statement that Daniel and his companions were eunuchs; the verse from which this is deduced; the question how they could have afterwards begotten children, etc. We read in B. *Sanhedrin*, 93b:—
ומבניך אשר יצאו ממך אשר תוליד יקחו והיו כריסים בחיכל
מלך בבל רב אמר סריסים ממש..... מאי טוב מבנים ומבנות
מבנים שהיו להם כבר ומרו..... From which we see that
this tradition did not survive in the popular consciousness;
it is stated as simply an individual opinion. Of the many
views enunciated, the most noteworthy is R. Jochanan's,
ib. 93a: עלו [חנניה משאל ועזריה] לארץ ישראל ונשאו נשים;
והולידו בנים ובנות. This, as Rashi remarks, stands in direct
opposition to the above. Cp. *Gen. R.*, c. 99; *Num. R.*, c. 13;
Esther R., c. 4; *Pirke de R. E.*, c. LII.

9.—MOSES, AUTHOR OF ELEVEN PSALMS.

Selecta in Psalmos, p. 514 (xii. 1055, M.), "Τσπερον δὲ κινού-
μενος περί τινων λογίων Θεοῦ Ἰουλλῶ τῷ πατριάρχῃ καὶ τινι
τῶν χρηματιζόντων παρὰ Ἰουδαίοις σοφῶν ἀκήκοα, ὅτι δι'
ὅλης τῆς βίβλου ψαλμῶν . . . οἱ παρ' Ἑβραίοις ἀνεπίγραφοι
ἢ ἐπιγραφὴν μὲν ἔχοντες, οὐχὶ δὲ τὸ ὄνομα τοῦ γράψαντος,
ἐκείνου εἰσὶν οὗ τὸ ὄνομα φέρεται ἐν τῷ πρὸ τούτων ἐπιγραφὴν
ἔχοντι ψαλμῷ. καὶ περὶ τούτων λέγων, πρότερον μὲν ἔφασκεν,
ὅτι τρισκαίδεκα εἰσὶν ὁ τοῦ Μωυσέως εἵτα δὲ ἐξ ὧν ἀκήκοα
καὶ αὐτὸς . . . τὴν ἀνέφερον ἐπ' αὐτὸν, ὅτι εἰσὶν ἑνδεκα, εἵτα
πυθόμενος, τοῦ παρ' αὐτοῖς δοκοῦντος σοφοῦ, ἐμάνθανον, ὅτι
εἶεν ἑνδεκα.

Jerome, *adv. Ruff.*, c. 13, quotes the whole of this passage. He knows the tradition of Moses' authorship, gives it, however, not in the name of the Jews, but as a firmly established and self-evident truth:—Qui [Moses] non solum nobis quinque reliquit libros,..... sed undecim quoque Psalmos, ab octogesimo nono [LXX.]..... usque ad nonagesimum

nonum. Quod autem in plerisque codicibus nonagesimus octavus habet titulum *Psalmus David*, in Hebraico non habetur, hanc habente scriptura sancta consuetudinem, ut omnes psalmi qui cujus sint titulos non habent, his deputentur, quorum in prioribus psalmis nomina continentur (Ep. cxl. ad Cyprianum, c. 2).

This Midrash also is found in Jewish sources; *Pesikta de R. Kahana*, 198a, ed. Buber: אחד עשר מזמורים אמר משה: כנגד אחד עשר שבטים שבירך ואלו הן..... אמר ר' יהושוע עד כאן שמעתי מכאן ואילך את מחשב לעצמך. R. Joshua's words imply that this was an ancient tradition. It is found also in Midrash on Psalm xc. 3, *Yalkut Ps.*, § 841, Rashi to Psalm xc. 1; cp. Midrash on Psalm xc. 4: אחד עשר מזמורים: שאמר משה במכסים של נביאים אמרן.

10.—BEASTS AS EXECUTORS OF DIVINE PUNISHMENT.

Hom. in Ezek. iv. 7 (xiii. 701, M.), and *in Ezek.* xiv. 4: Aiunt etiam Judæi, si quando lupi homines devoraverint impetum facientes in domos, et cæteræ bestiæ, ut historia refert leones quondam in humanum genus immissos, et alio tempore ursos (II. Reg. xvii. 2) istius modi devorationes ex Dei indignatione descendere.

I have not found a parallel in Jewish sources, but the root idea is patent and needs no special tradition.

S. KRAUSS.

(*To be Continued.*)
